

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

7/12/2007 7:14:33 AM • Email Acknowledgement sent to troy@midcentury.com.

troy@midcentury.com wrote on 6/11/2007 9:02:33 AM :

June 8, 2007

Commissioner Deborah Taylor Tate  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Room 8-A204  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: In the Matter of High-Cost Universal Service Support, WC Docket No. 05-337; In the Matter of Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, CC Docket No. 96-45

Dear Commissioner Tate:

I am writing to endorse the recommendation of the Joint Board on Universal Service to place an interim, emergency cap on the amount of high-cost universal service support that competitive eligible telecommunications carriers may receive.

I appreciate your leadership and that of the other members of the Joint Board and staff as you consider the difficult questions associated with the distribution mechanism for universal service support.

We believe that this first step is the best way to begin a process to preserve universal service for the benefit of consumers. Without this critical action and leadership on the part of the Joint Board, the benefits that universal service provides to rural consumers would be in serious jeopardy.

Sincerely,

Troy Kirgan  
Mid Century Telephone

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

7/12/2007 7:14:24 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to martie@mdtc.net.

martie@mdtc.net wrote on 6/11/2007 9:50:51 AM :

---

Commissioner Deborah Taylor Tate  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Room 8-A204  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: In the Matter of High-Cost Universal Service Support, WC Docket No. 05-337; In the Matter of Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, CC Docket No. 96-45

Dear Commissioner Tate:

I am writing to endorse the recommendation of the Joint Board on Universal Service to place an interim, emergency cap on the amount of high-cost universal service support that competitive eligible telecommunications carriers may receive.

I appreciate your leadership and that of the other members of the Joint Board and staff as you consider the difficult questions associated with the distribution mechanism for universal service support.

We believe that this first step is the best way to begin a process to preserve universal service for the benefit of consumers. Without this critical action and leadership on the part of the Joint Board, the benefits that universal service provides to rural consumers would be in serious jeopardy.

Sincerely,

Martie Ravenscraft McDonough Telephone Cooperative, Inc.

cc: Chairman Kevin J. Martin

Commissioner Jonathan Adelstein

Commissioner Michael J. Copps

Commissioner Robert M. McDowell

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45.

DKi9993062@aol.com wrote on 7/1/2007 7:39:18 PM :

RE: CG Docket No. 03-123

Dear Chairman Martin, Commissioners Adelstein, Copps, McDowell, and Tate:

I am a deaf person and I use Video Relay Service (VRS) to communicate. I was appalled to learn that the FCC staff is intent on drastically cutting the VRS rate, and effectively cutting VRS availability for the deaf. Instead of seeking to limit the number of deaf people with VRS access, the FCC should do everything in its power to make VRS available to more deaf people.

I, along with other Deaf individuals, use these services in both my work and personal life. It is an important way in which I/we communicate with both hearing and deaf individuals. I urge you to do everything you can to make VRS service available to the many deaf people who currently do not have access to this vital, life-changing service.

The VRS rate should encourage the VRS providers to:

- Serve more deaf people, not discourage them from reaching out to more deaf people
- Improve service and technology so the mandate of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) for functionally equivalent telecommunications services is met

I, along with other deaf individuals, their families and coworkers, depend on VRS and other relay services.

Please stop any VRS program cuts and fulfill the mandate of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) to provide deaf people with functionally equivalent telecommunications services.

Thank you.  
David Kisiel

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45.  
USF CAP

AB

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

8/21/2007 10:01:01 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to ncbabe22@hotmail.com.

ncbabe22@hotmail.com wrote on 8/15/2007 1:09:40 PM :

necole cook  
502 Poage Lane Apt17  
Salem, VA 24153-2954

August 15, 2007

Robert McDowell

Dear Robert McDowell:

I understand that the FCC is considering several measures regarding the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to urge you to oppose any proposal that would result in less wireless funding. Ideas like the proposed wireless-only cap are clearly anti-competitive, because they single out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if USF funding for wireless is reduced, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

Commissioner McDowell, I urge you to vote against any proposal that would result in less funding for wireless service. Rural residents of Virginia and everywhere in America are counting on you to protect our public safety and encourage economic growth by supporting wireless funding from the USF.

Sincerely,

necole cook

FILED/ACCEPTED

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45. AB  
USF CAP

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

8/21/2007 10:01:59 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to mgseid@cox.net.

mgseid@cox.net wrote on 8/15/2007 8:27:19 PM :

Mildred Seid  
1524 Waterside Dr., N., Chesapeake, VA 23320  
Chesapeake, VA 23320-2716

August 15, 2007

Robert McDowell

Dear Robert McDowell:

I understand that the FCC is considering several measures regarding the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to urge you to oppose any proposal that would result in less wireless funding. Ideas like the proposed wireless-only cap are clearly anti-competitive, because they single out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if USF funding for wireless is reduced, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

Commissioner McDowell, I urge you to vote against any proposal that would result in less funding for wireless service. Rural residents of Virginia and everywhere in America are counting on you to protect our public safety and encourage economic growth by supporting wireless funding from the USF.

Sincerely,

Mildred Seid

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45. AB  
USF CAP

8/21/2007 9:47:51 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to wpretendseagle@gmail.com.

wpretendseagle@gmail.com wrote on 8/15/2007 12:40:46 PM :

Waylon Pretends Eagle  
1124 Columbus Street  
Rapid City, SD 57701-3547

August 15, 2007

Marlene Dortch  
Secretary, Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Room TW-B204  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Ms. Dortch:

I understand that the FCC is considering placing a cap on the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to express my opposition to this unfair, arbitrary proposal. A wireless-only cap is clearly anti-competitive because it singles out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if the recommended cap is implemented, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

I urge the FCC to vote against the proposed cap on universal service support for wireless service.

Sincerely,

Waylon Pretends Eagle  
605-348-4127

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45.  
USF CAP

AB

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

8/21/2007 10:03:10 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to emailby2@cox.net.

emailby2@cox.net wrote on 8/16/2007 5:18:16 PM :

Edward Maltby  
922 W. Ocean View Ave  
Norfolk, VA 23503-1380

August 16, 2007

Robert McDowell

Dear Robert McDowell:

I understand that the FCC is considering several measures regarding the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to urge you to oppose any proposal that would result in less wireless funding. Ideas like the proposed wireless-only cap are clearly anti-competitive, because they single out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if USF funding for wireless is reduced, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

Commissioner McDowell, I urge you to vote against any proposal that would result in less funding for wireless service. Rural residents of Virginia and everywhere in America are counting on you to protect our public safety and encourage economic growth by supporting wireless funding from the USF.

Sincerely,

Edward Maltby

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45. AB  
USF CAP

8/21/2007 9:56:18 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to mrsdkip@aol.com.

mrsdkip@aol.com wrote on 8/9/2007 8:14:44 PM :

Patricia Webb  
134 Patrick St. SE  
Vienna, VA 22180-6653

August 9, 2007

Robert McDowell

Dear Robert McDowell:

I understand that the FCC is considering several measures regarding the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to urge you to oppose any proposal that would result in less wireless funding. Ideas like the proposed wireless-only cap are clearly anti-competitive, because they single out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if USF funding for wireless is reduced, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

Commissioner McDowell, I urge you to vote against any proposal that would result in less funding for wireless service. Rural residents of Virginia and everywhere in America are counting on you to protect our public safety and encourage economic growth by supporting wireless funding from the USF.

Sincerely,

Patricia Webb  
703-698-9017

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Office of the Secretary



NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45. AB  
USF CAP

8/21/2007 9:56:43 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to habitatforwildlife@habitatforwildlife.com.

habitatforwildlife@habitatforwildlife.com wrote on 8/9/2007 11:50:22 PM :

jay antol  
2565 SHORE DR  
VIRGINIA BEACH, VA 23451-1452

August 9, 2007

Robert McDowell

Dear Robert McDowell:

I understand that the FCC is considering several measures regarding the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to urge you to oppose any proposal that would result in less wireless funding. Ideas like the proposed wireless-only cap are clearly anti-competitive, because they single out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if USF funding for wireless is reduced, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

Commissioner McDowell, I urge you to vote against any proposal that would result in less funding for wireless service. Rural residents of Virginia and everywhere in America are counting on you to protect our public safety and encourage economic growth by supporting wireless funding from the USF.

Sincerely,

jay antol

FILED/ACCEPTED

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 06-45.  
USF CAP

AB

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

8/21/2007 9:48:28 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to packer@iw.net.

packer@iw.net wrote on 8/15/2007 2:38:33 PM :

Daniel J. Moran  
725 N.E. 3rd. St.  
Madison, SD 57042-2409

August 15, 2007

Marlene Dortch  
Secretary, Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Room TW-B204  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Ms. Dortch:

I understand that the FCC is considering placing a cap on the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to express my opposition to this unfair, arbitrary proposal. A wireless-only cap is clearly anti-competitive because it singles out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if the recommended cap is implemented, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

I urge the FCC to vote against the proposed cap on universal service support for wireless service.

Sincerely,

Dr. Daniel J. Moran  
605-480-2711

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45.  
USF CAP

AB

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

8/21/2007 9:48:49 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to joey73@adelphia.net.

joey73@adelphia.net wrote on 8/16/2007 1:54:49 PM :

Patrick Murray  
P.O. Box 429  
Dublin, VA 24084-0429

August 16, 2007

Marlene Dortch  
Secretary, Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Room TW-B204  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Ms. Dortch:

I understand that the FCC is considering placing a cap on the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to express my opposition to this unfair, arbitrary proposal. A wireless-only cap is clearly anti-competitive because it singles out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if the recommended cap is implemented, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

I urge the FCC to vote against the proposed cap on universal service support for wireless service.

Sincerely,

Patrick Murray

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 06-45. AB  
USF CAP

8/21/2007 9:50:37 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to jn8v@virginia.edu.

jn8v@virginia.edu wrote on 8/9/2007 1:53:09 PM :

Jenny Nowlen  
132 Westwood Circle  
Charlottesville, VA 22903-5147

August 9, 2007

Robert McDowell

Dear Robert McDowell:

I understand that the FCC is considering several measures regarding the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to urge you to oppose any proposal that would result in less wireless funding. Ideas like the proposed wireless-only cap are clearly anti-competitive, because they single out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if USF funding for wireless is reduced, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

Commissioner McDowell, I urge you to vote against any proposal that would result in less funding for wireless service. Rural residents of Virginia and everywhere in America are counting on you to protect our public safety and encourage economic growth by supporting wireless funding from the USF.

Sincerely,

Jenny Nowlen  
434-296-7571

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45.  
USF CAP

AB

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

8/21/2007 9:51:15 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to jlpadgett@adelphia.net.

jlpadgett@adelphia.net wrote on 8/9/2007 2:17:47 PM :

Jewel Padgett  
99 Joy Ranch Road  
Woodlawn, VA 24381-1213

August 9, 2007

Robert McDowell

Dear Robert McDowell:

I understand that the FCC is considering several measures regarding the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to urge you to oppose any proposal that would result in less wireless funding. Ideas like the proposed wireless-only cap are clearly anti-competitive, because they single out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if USF funding for wireless is reduced, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

Commissioner McDowell, I urge you to vote against any proposal that would result in less funding for wireless service. Rural residents of Virginia and everywhere in America are counting on you to protect our public safety and encourage economic growth by supporting wireless funding from the USF.

Sincerely,

Jewel Padgett

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45.  
USF CAP

AB

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

8/21/2007 9:51:38 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to cs\_social\_butterfly@yahoo.com.

cs\_social\_butterfly@yahoo.com wrote on 8/9/2007 2:39:10 PM :

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Mary-Elise Sheets  
2018 Peach Orchard Drive #22  
Falls Church, VA 22043-2046

August 9, 2007

Robert McDowell

Dear Robert McDowell:

I understand that the FCC is considering several measures regarding the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to urge you to oppose any proposal that would result in less wireless funding. Ideas like the proposed wireless-only cap are clearly anti-competitive, because they single out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if USF funding for wireless is reduced, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

Commissioner McDowell, I urge you to vote against any proposal that would result in less funding for wireless service. Rural residents of Virginia and everywhere in America are counting on you to protect our public safety and encourage economic growth by supporting wireless funding from the USF.

Sincerely,

Mary-Elise Sheets

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45.  
USF CAP

AB

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

8/21/2007 9:52:12 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to gbloomer@gwtc.net.

gbloomer@gwtc.net wrote on 8/9/2007 3:11:12 PM :

Jerry Bloomer  
2146 Minnekahta Avenue  
Hot Springs, SD 57747-1212

August 9, 2007

Jonathan Adelstein

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I understand that the FCC is considering several measures regarding the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to urge you to oppose any proposal that would result in less wireless funding. Ideas like the proposed wireless-only cap are clearly anti-competitive, because they single out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if USF funding for wireless is reduced, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

Commissioner Adelstein, I urge you to vote against any proposal that would result in less funding for wireless service. Rural residents of South Dakota and everywhere in America are counting on you to protect our public safety and encourage economic growth by supporting wireless funding from the USF.

Sincerely,

Jerry Bloomer

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45.  
USF CAP

AB

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

8/21/2007 9:54:20 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to brihan@msn.com.

brihan@msn.com wrote on 8/9/2007 4:19:18 PM :

Sandra Baltazar  
PO Box 688  
Edgemont, SD 57735-0688

August 9, 2007

Jonathan Adelstein

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I understand that the FCC is considering several measures regarding the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to urge you to oppose any proposal that would result in less wireless funding. Ideas like the proposed wireless-only cap are clearly anti-competitive, because they single out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if USF funding for wireless is reduced, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

Commissioner Adelstein, I urge you to vote against any proposal that would result in less funding for wireless service. Rural residents of South Dakota and everywhere in America are counting on you to protect our public safety and encourage economic growth by supporting wireless funding from the USF.

Sincerely,

Sandra R Baltazar



Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45.  
USF CAP

AB

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

8/21/2007 9:54:55 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to koepsellrc@yahoo.com.

koepsellrc@yahoo.com wrote on 8/9/2007 6:36:50 PM :

Richard Koepsell  
534 South Keswick Dr.  
Troy, VA 22974-3861

August 9, 2007

Robert McDowell

Dear Robert McDowell:

I understand that the FCC is considering several measures regarding the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to urge you to oppose any proposal that would result in less wireless funding. Ideas like the proposed wireless-only cap are clearly anti-competitive, because they single out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if USF funding for wireless is reduced, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

Commissioner McDowell, I urge you to vote against any proposal that would result in less funding for wireless service. Rural residents of Virginia and everywhere in America are counting on you to protect our public safety and encourage economic growth by supporting wireless funding from the USF.

Sincerely,

Richard Koepsell

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45. AB  
USF CAP

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

8/21/2007 9:59:07 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to connie.skidmore@earthlink.net.

connie.skidmore@earthlink.net wrote on 8/15/2007 8:44:18 AM :

Claire Skidmore  
4404 Eaglebrook Dr.  
Williamsburg, VA 23188-8038

August 15, 2007

Robert McDowell

Dear Robert McDowell:

I understand that the FCC is considering several measures regarding the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to urge you to oppose any proposal that would result in less wireless funding. Ideas like the proposed wireless-only cap are clearly anti-competitive, because they single out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if USF funding for wireless is reduced, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

Commissioner McDowell, I urge you to vote against any proposal that would result in less funding for wireless service. Rural residents of Virginia and everywhere in America are counting on you to protect our public safety and encourage economic growth by supporting wireless funding from the USF.

Sincerely,

Claire Skidmore

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 06-45.  
USF CAP

AB

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

8/21/2007 9:58:28 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to narshallow@gmail.com.

narshallow@gmail.com wrote on 8/12/2007 1:43:03 AM :

Stephanie Fleming  
15283 Monticello Dr.  
Bristol, VA 24202-4103

August 12, 2007

Robert McDowell

Dear Robert McDowell:

I understand that the FCC is considering several measures regarding the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to urge you to oppose any proposal that would result in less wireless funding. Ideas like the proposed wireless-only cap are clearly anti-competitive, because they single out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if USF funding for wireless is reduced, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

Commissioner McDowell, I urge you to vote against any proposal that would result in less funding for wireless service. Rural residents of Virginia and everywhere in America are counting on you to protect our public safety and encourage economic growth by supporting wireless funding from the USF.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Fleming

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45.  
USF CAP

AB

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

8/21/2007 9:57:27 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to rorygep@gmail.com.

rorygep@gmail.com wrote on 8/10/2007 1:56:33 PM :

Rory McIlmoil  
4111 Lakeview Parkway  
Locust Grove, VA 22508-5459

August 10, 2007

Robert McDowell

Dear Robert McDowell:

I understand that the FCC is considering several measures regarding the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to urge you to oppose any proposal that would result in less wireless funding. Ideas like the proposed wireless-only cap are clearly anti-competitive, because they single out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if USF funding for wireless is reduced, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

Commissioner McDowell , I urge you to vote against any proposal that would result in less funding for wireless service. Rural residents of Virginia and everywhere in America are counting on you to protect our public safety and encourage economic growth by supporting wireless funding from the USF.

Sincerely,

Rory McIlmoil

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45.  
USF CAP

AB

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

8/21/2007 9:47:24 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to ninjagrrl1977@gmail.com.

ninjagrrl1977@gmail.com wrote on 8/15/2007 12:37:23 PM :

Heather Morris  
2515 Chesapeake St. #A  
Staunton, VA 24401-3747

August 15, 2007

Marlene Dortch  
Secretary, Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Room TW-B204  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Ms. Dortch:

I understand that the FCC is considering placing a cap on the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to express my opposition to this unfair, arbitrary proposal. A wireless-only cap is clearly anti-competitive because it singles out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if the recommended cap is implemented, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

I urge the FCC to vote against the proposed cap on universal service support for wireless service.

Sincerely,

Heather

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45. AB  
USF CAP

8/21/2007 9:46:48 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to kingms@jmu.edu.

kingms@jmu.edu wrote on 8/15/2007 12:33:00 PM :

Michael King  
51 Hillandale Dr.  
Staunton, VA 24401-6540

August 15, 2007

Marlene Dortch  
Secretary, Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Room TW-B204  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Ms. Dortch:

I understand that the FCC is considering placing a cap on the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to express my opposition to this unfair, arbitrary proposal. A wireless-only cap is clearly anti-competitive because it singles out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if the recommended cap is implemented, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

I urge the FCC to vote against the proposed cap on universal service support for wireless service.

Sincerely,

Michael King

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45. AB  
USF CAP

8/21/2007 9:59:50 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to dolanroofn@aol.com.

dolanroofn@aol.com wrote on 8/15/2007 10:24:08 AM :

harry dolan  
11710 belfonte rd  
bumpass, VA 23024-8902

August 15, 2007

Robert McDowell

Dear Robert McDowell:

I understand that the FCC is considering several measures regarding the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to urge you to oppose any proposal that would result in less wireless funding. Ideas like the proposed wireless-only cap are clearly anti-competitive, because they single out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if USF funding for wireless is reduced, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

Commissioner McDowell, I urge you to vote against any proposal that would result in less funding for wireless service. Rural residents of Virginia and everywhere in America are counting on you to protect our public safety and encourage economic growth by supporting wireless funding from the USF.

Sincerely,

harry dolan  
5408959843

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45. AB  
USF CAP

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

8/24/2007 11:31:58 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to snailkite2@comcast.net.

snailkite2@comcast.net wrote on 8/24/2007 11:19:46 AM :

Dan Deans  
43770 Laburnum Sq  
Ashburn, VA 20147-5442

August 11, 2007

Marlene Dortch  
Secretary, Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Room TW-B204  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Ms. Dortch:

I understand that the FCC is considering placing a cap on the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to express my opposition to this unfair, arbitrary proposal. A wireless-only cap is clearly anti-competitive because it singles out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country? Isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if the recommended cap is implemented, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

I urge the FCC to vote against the proposed cap on universal service support for wireless service.

Sincerely,

Dan Deans



Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45.  
USF CAP

**DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL**

05-337

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

**NOV - 2 2007**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

8/21/2007 9:57:37 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to skinnykhai@nwench.com.

skinnykhai@nwench.com wrote on 8/10/2007 7:09:56 PM :

Michael Weigle  
10855 Santa Clara Drive  
Fairfax, VA 22030-4465

August 10, 2007

Robert McDowell

Dear Robert McDowell:

I understand that the FCC is considering several measures regarding the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to urge you to oppose any proposal that would result in less wireless funding. Ideas like the proposed wireless-only cap are clearly anti-competitive, because they single out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if USF funding for wireless is reduced, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

Commissioner McDowell, I urge you to vote against any proposal that would result in less funding for wireless service. Rural residents of Virginia and everywhere in America are counting on you to protect our public safety and encourage economic growth by supporting wireless funding from the USF.

Sincerely,

Michael Weigle

No. of Copies rec'd 0  
List ABCDE